

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/706,853	11/12/2003	Matthew Telles	Telles-001	. 6077	
75	90 11/16/2004	EXAMINER		INER	
McCrystle & Associates			VALENTI, ANDREA M		
P.O. BOX 848 Belmont, CA 94002			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Donnon, Cri	71002		3643		
			DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004	DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<del></del>		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/706,853	TELLES, MATTHEW	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrea M. Valenti	3643 UM/	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from became ABANDONE	nely filed  rs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 S</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This      Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under E	s action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Set tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received. Is have been received in Application rity documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		

Art Unit: 3643

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,101,109 to Edwards in view of U.S. Patent Des. 228,360 to Sunshine.

Regarding Claim 1, Edwards teaches hanger adapted for retaining and hanging objects, the hanger comprising: a ring (Edwards #54); at least two upper flexible members (Edwards #51 and 52) having first and second ends, wherein each member is received through an aperture of said ring (Edwards Fig. 1), said flexible members defining an upper portion of said hanger; a lower hanger portion, said lower hanger portion including of at least two lower flexible members (Edwards #51 and 52 below elements #55 and 59) having first and second ends, the first and second ends including an adjustment means (Edwards #55 and 59) configured to receive said second ends of said upper flexible members and a flexible retaining ring, said flexible retaining ring configured to receive said first and second ends of said lower flexible members, wherein said retaining ring (Edwards #61, 71, 74, 48, 47) is configured to retain said ends of said lower flexible members at a distance spaced apart from one another.

Edwards is silent on each of the two members are fixedly attached to each other at a midpoint. However, Sunshine teaches a hanger adapted for retaining objects,

**Art Unit: 3643** 

which the lower flexible members are fixedly attached at a midpoint (Sunshine Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Edwards with the teachings of Sunshine since the modification is merely the selection of a known alternate equivalent means of harnessing modified to provide additional support to the center of the object and does not present a patentably distinct limitation.

Regarding Claims 2 and 3, Edwards as modified teaches flexible members, but is silent on nylon. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings at the time of the invention since the modification is merely the selection of a known material for intended use selected as an engineering design choice to achieve certain design parameters such as cost [Leshin 125 USPQ 416].

Regarding Claim 4, Edwards as modified teaches wherein said flexible retaining ring has an adjustable length (Edwards #64).

Regarding Claim 5, Edwards as modified teaches the upper and lower flexible members are cylindrical in cross-section (Sunshine Fig.1-4).

Regarding Claim 6, Edwards as modified is silent on the ring is constructed of a material chosen from the group consisting of steel, stainless steel, titanium, ceramic, plastic. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings at the time of the invention since the modification is merely the selection of a known material for intended use selected as an engineering design choice to achieve certain design parameters such as cost [Leshin 125 USPQ 416].

Regarding Claim 7, Edwards as modified teaches the lower hanger portion is configured to retain a plant container (Sunshine title).

Art Unit: 3643

Regarding Claim 8, Edwards as modified teaches the lower hanger portion is configured to retain an audio loudspeaker (Edwards title).

Regarding Claim 9, Edwards as modified teaches the said adjustment means is a buckle (Edwards #55 and 59).

Regarding Claims 10 and 16, Edwards as modified teaches the broadly presented limitation that the container supporting member further including a third flexible support member, wherein said third flexible member (Edwards #62) is configured to be fixedly attached adjacent to the first and second ends of said flexible members comprising said container supporting member.

However, it can also be viewed that the addition of a third flexible member is an obvious modification to one of ordinary skill in the art since the modification is merely the duplication of a known element for a multiple effect performing the same intended function modified for heavier objects or objects with unusual configurations.

Regarding Claim 11, Edwards as modified teaches said flexible upper members further include means configured to adjust said length of said members disposed through said aperture of said ring (Edwards #55 and 59).

Regarding Claim 12, Edwards as modified is silent on a material chosen from the group consisting of nylon webbing, a cotton webbing, leather, plastic webbing, nylon rope, cotton rope, steel rope, steel webbing, chain and textile. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings at the time of the invention since the modification is merely the selection of a known material for intended

Art Unit: 3643

use selected as an engineering design choice to achieve certain design parameters such as cost [Leshin 125 USPQ 416].

Regarding Claim 13, Edwards as modified is silent on said flexible memberd of container support member are constructed of a material chosen from the group consisting of: nylon webbing, cotton webbing, Leather, plastic webbing, nylon rope, cotton rope, steel rope, steel webbing, chain and textile. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings at the time of the invention since the modification is merely the selection of a known material for intended use selected as an engineering design choice to achieve certain design parameters such as cost [Leshin 125 USPQ 416].

Regarding Claim 14, Edwards as modified teaches the third flexible member forms a **generally** cylindrical shaped member (Edwards #62).

Regarding Claim 15, Edwards as modified teaches the third flexible member further includes a length adjustment member (Edwards #65).

Regarding Claim 17, Edwards as modified is silent on the first ring is constructed of a material selected from the group consisting of ferrous metals, non-ferrous metals, plastics, composites and ceramics. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings at the time of the invention since the modification is merely the selection of a known material for intended use selected as an engineering design choice to achieve certain design parameters such as cost [Leshin 125 USPQ 416].

Regarding Claim 18, Edwards as modified is silent on including an insulated cooler disposed with in the container supporting member. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Edwards at the time of the invention since the modification is merely the selection of an alternate article to store in a suspended state for an efficient use of space to keep food at an elevated location does not present a patentably distinct limitation. It is old and notoriously well-known to support various articles of shapes and sizes in a suspended state and merely selecting one article versus another article is an obvious modification to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding Claim 19, Edwards as modified teaches the ends of the upper flexible members include a buckle portion (Edwards #55 and 59) disposed thereon and the container support members further includes a buckle portion (Edwards the apertures in the lower strap members that the pin of the buckle goes through) disposed on the ends of the flexible members thereon, wherein each of the buckle portions are configured to detachably receive one another.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3643

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea M. Valenti whose telephone number is 703-305-3010. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5pm M-F; Alternating Fridays Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Poon can be reached on 703-308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrea M. Valenti Patent Examiner Art Unit 3643

08 November 2004

Peter M. Poon

Vota Von

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 3600

Page 8